

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/786,771	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YHANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dan Washburn	<b>Art Unit</b> 2628	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** allowed

(1) Dan Washburn.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Daniel Burns.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 23 February 2007

**Time:** 3 pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*101 rejection of claims 1-28*

**Claims discussed:**

*1 and 22*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*none*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Washburn contacted Attorney Burns regarding amending claims 1 and 22 to put the application in allowable form. Claim 1 did not have a tangible output, so Attorney Burns and Examiner Washburn agreed on adding the limitation, "and displaying the raster representation on a display device or printing the raster representation on a printing device" in order to overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection. Further, Examiner Washburn recommended altering the beginning of the preamble of claim 22 so that it reads, "A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a computer program product..." in order to ensure that the claim is directed at a computer-readable medium storing a computer program product rather than a computer program product that may be stored on a computer-readable medium. Attorney Burns agreed to the changes.